Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that each of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of January 22, 2008, have been considered.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 9, 19-24, 27-29, and 31-64 are pending in the application. Claims 27, 35, 48, and 63 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the claim amendments: (a) place this application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein), (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution as indicated in the Final Office Action), (c) present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal (should an appeal be necessary), and (d) are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the Final Office Action.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

1. Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e): Bald:

Claims 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,744,259 to Bald. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

  a. Claim 27:

With respect to independent claim 27, on pages 2-3 of the Office Action mailed on March 11, 2008 (hereinafter the "Office Action"), the Examiner alleges that Bald discloses all of the limitations of the invention as recited in this claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is currently amended to clarify the generation of button functions in order to more clearly distinguish the invention as claimed from the documents cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that none of the

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

references cited by the Examiner discloses, teaches, or suggests all of the limitations presently recited in independent claim 27, for at least the following reasons.

Bald is directed to a safety compliance test instrument which includes a front panel (18) having a plurality of soft keys (1-4) and a display screen (20) capable of displaying menus and prompts that are activated by soft keys 1-4. See, Bald, col. 4, lines 26-37. However, Bald does not describe generating sub-functions for the buttons as presently recited in claim 27. That is, Bald describes that upon power up of the safety compliance test instrument a verification menu appears. See Bald, Col. 5, lines 35-62, FIG. 3. The verification menu 30 allows a user to select one of four tests by using arrow softkeys to scroll between the tests and a select softkey to select the test to perform. Id. However, once the test has been selected the soft keys are not used during the performance of the test. That is, as illustrated in FIGS. 4A-7C of Bald, once a particular test is selected the safety compliance test instrument merely illustrates instructions for performing the test using additional keys/buttons of the safety compliance test instrument. In other words, the softkeys in Bald are only assigned one function (to scroll, to select, or to exit) and Bald does not describe generating additional functions for the softkeys.

Accordingly, Bald does not disclose or teach, among other things, "generating sub-functions of at least one of the first and second buttons according to the generated first and second function," as presently recited in claim 27. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that since Bald does not teach all of the elements presently set forth in claim 27, this claim is patentably distinguishable from Bald, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

  b. Claims 28-34:

With respect to dependent claims 28-34, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 27, which is patentably distinguishable from Bald for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, since claims 28-34 contain each of the features as presently recited in independent claim 27, these dependent claims are also patentably distinguishable from Bald, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 32-33, Applicant respectfully submits that Bald does not disclose or teach the limitations recited in this claim. In particular, as described above,

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

Bald describes a verification menu 30 that allows a user to select one of four tests of the safety compliance test instrument using arrow softkeys to scroll between the tests and a select softkey to select the test to perform. *See* Bald, Col. 5, lines 35-62, FIG. 3. However, once the test has been selected the soft keys are not used during the performance of the test. That is, as illustrated in FIGS. 4A-7C of Bald, once a particular test is selected the safety compliance test instrument merely illustrates instructions for performing the test using additional keys/buttons of the safety compliance test instrument. In other words, the softkeys in Bald are only assigned one function (to scroll, to select, or to exit) and Bald does not describe changing the function of the softkeys.

Accordingly, Bald does not disclose or teach, among other things, "changing one of the first functions to another function corresponding to the first button to be displayed on the screen," as recited in claim 32, or "wherein at least one of the first functions and the second functions is programmable," as recited in claim 33. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 32-33 are themselves patentably distinguishable from Bald, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims.

Moreover, Applicant points out that claim 30 is cancelled, rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

2. Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e): Yu:

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,034 to Yu. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Yu discloses all of the limitations of the invention as recited in claim 64. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Yu discloses:

> wherein the at least one symbol visually corresponds to at least one input unit (fig. 3, item 103), the at least one input unit is disposed near the at least one symbol (fig 3, item 303), and the at least one input unit is disposed so as to be substantially flush with the surface of the screen (fig. 3, item 201).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Yu does not disclose the limitations of claim 64 as alleged by the Examiner. In particular, Yu does not disclose that the input unit is disposed to be substantially flush with a surface of the screen. Instead, Yu describes a set of controls

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

buttons 102 which are disposed at a side frame surface 100 of a flat panel display 10. *See* Yu, Col. 2, lines 45+, FIG. 1. Further, contrary to the Examiner's allegations item 201 of Yu does not correspond to an input unit. Instead, item 201 of Yu describes an indicating light 201 to indicate an on/off status of the display. Accordingly, since the control buttons 102 are disposed on a side frame of the display unit, and since the indicating light 201 is not an input unit, Yu does not disclose "wherein the at least one symbol visually corresponds to at least one input unit, the at least one input unit is disposed near the at least one symbol, and the at least one input unit is disposed so as to be substantially flush with the surface of the screen," as recited in this claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the...claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim..." In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Accordingly, since Yu does not teach all of the elements set forth in independent claim 64, independent claim 64 is patentably distinguishable over Yu, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

3. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a): Bald and Badger:

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bald in view of Badger. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

a. Claim 1:

With respect to independent claim 1, on pages 5-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Bald in view of Badger disclose all of the limitations recited in this claim. However, Applicant respectfully submits that these references do not disclose or teach the limitations of the invention as recited in independent claim 1, for at least the following reasons.

As admitted by the Examiner, Bald does not disclose detecting a pivot angle and displaying an image rotated according to the pivot angle. *See* Office Action, page 5. Moreover, Badger also does not teach or suggest the limitations presently recited in this claim, either

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

individually or combined with any of the other cited references. That is, Badger is limited at describing modifying a full computer image according to a selected orientation of a computer display. *See* Badger, Col. 2, lines 5-16. Badger does not describe or teach rotating individual images associated with buttons or maintaining the relationship of the pivoted images to the position of the buttons.   In other words, Badger would rotate the whole image of the computer screen, not just the images associated with the buttons, and does not describe maintaining the position relationship between the buttons and the rotated images. Accordingly, Badger is not combinable with Bald to disclose or teach, among other things, "wherein the image is displayed at a position on the image display apparatus close to the buttons, and wherein the displaying of the image on the image display apparatus further comprises: detecting a pivot angle of the image display apparatus, and displaying the image rotated according to the pivot angle," as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that since Bald does not teach all of the elements set forth in claim 1, this claim is patentably distinguishable from Bald.   Furthermore, since Badger also does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in this claim, either individually or combined with any of the other cited references, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over all the cited references, and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim.

b. Claims 2-4:

With respect to dependent claims 2-4, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 1, which is patentable over Bald and Badger for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, since claims 2-4 contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-4 are also patentably distinguishable from Bald and Badger, either individually or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

4. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a): Badger and Bald:

Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Badger in view of Bald. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

a. Claim 7:

With respect to independent claim 7, on pages 6-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Bald in view of Badger disclose all of the limitations recited in this claim. However, Applicant respectfully submits that these references do not disclose or teach the limitations of the invention as recited in independent claim 7, for at least the following reasons.

As described above, Badger does not describe or teach rotating individual images associated with buttons or maintaining the relationship of the pivoted images to the position of the buttons. Instead, Badger is directed at rotating whole images of a computer display according to a rotation of the computer display. Badger would rotate the whole image of the computer screen, not just the images associated with the buttons, and Badger does not describe maintaining the position relationship between the buttons and the rotated images. Accordingly, Badger is not combinable with Bald to disclose or teach, among other things, "wherein: the image display unit has zones to display an image indicating functions assigned to the buttons, and the controller generates image information to be displayed in the zones and supplies the image information to the graphics processing unit, the zones to display an image indicating functions assigned the buttons are displayed at a position on the image display apparatus close to the buttons, and the graphics processing unit displays the image in the zones rotated according to the pivot angle," as recited in independent claim 7.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that since Bald does not teach all of the elements set forth in claim 7, this claim is patentably distinguishable from Bald. Furthermore, since Badger also does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in this claim, either individually or combined with any of the other cited references, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is allowable over all the cited references, and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim.

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

b. Claim 9:

With respect to dependent claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that this claim depends from independent claim 7, which is patentable over Bald and Badger for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, since claim 9 contains each of the features as recited in independent claim 7, this claim is also patentably distinguishable from Bald and Badger, either individually or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

5. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a): Bald and Badger:

Claims 19-23 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bald in view of Badger. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

a. Claim 19:

With respect to independent claim 19, on pages 8-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Bald in view of Badger disclose all of the limitations recited in this claim. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose or teach the limitations of the invention as recited in independent claim 19, for at least the following reasons.

As described above, Badger does not describe or teach rotating individual images associated with buttons or maintaining a relationship of the pivoted images to the position of the buttons. Instead, Badger is directed at rotating whole images of a computer display according to a rotation of the computer display. That is, Badger would rotate the whole image of the computer screen, not just the images associated with the buttons within the zones of the display, and thus, Badger does not describe rotating the images within zones of the display. Accordingly, Badger is not combinable with Bald to disclose or teach, among other things, "an image display unit including zones to display an image indicating functions assigned to the buttons," "a graphics processing unit to supply images displayed by the image display unit," and "a pivot detector to detect a pivot angle of the image display unit and to provide the pivot angle detected to the graphics processing unit such that the graphics processing unit supplies an image to the image display unit at a same pivot angle as the image display unit," as recited in claim 19.

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that since Bald in view of Badger does not teach all of the elements presently set forth in claim 19, this claim is patentably distinguishable from Bald and Badger, either individually or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

b. Claims 20-23:

With respect to dependent claims 20-23, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 19, which is patentable over Bald and Badger for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, since claims 20-23 contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 19, dependent claims 20-23 are also patentably distinguishable from Bald and Badger, either individually or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited.

c. Claim 35:

With respect to independent claim 35, on pages 9-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Bald in view of Badger disclose all of the limitations recited in this claim. However, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is currently amended to more clearly define the graphics processing unit to further distinguish the invention as claimed from the cited documents. Accordingly, the cited references do not disclose or teach the limitations of the invention as presently recited in independent claim 35, for at least the following reasons.

As described above, Badger does not describe or teach rotating individual images associated with buttons or maintaining a relationship of the pivoted images to the position of the buttons. Instead, Badger is directed at rotating whole images of a computer display according to a rotation of the computer display. That is, Badger would rotate the whole image of the computer screen, not just the images associated with the buttons, and Badger would not maintain the position relationship between the buttons and the rotated images. Accordingly, Badger is not combinable with Bald to disclose or teach, among other things, "a graphics processing unit to process at least one function of the respective at least one button to be displayed on the screen at a position corresponding to the at least one button," and "a pivot detector to detect a pivot angle of the image display unit and to provide the pivot angle detected to the graphics processing unit such that the graphics processing unit supplies an image to the

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

image display unit at a same pivot angle as the image display unit," as presently recited in claim 35.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that since Bald in view of Badger does not teach all of the elements presently set forth in claim 35, this claim is patentably distinguishable from Bald and Badger, either individually or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

    d. Claim 36:

With respect to dependent claim 36, it is respectfully submitted that this claim depends from independent claim 35, which is patentable over Bald and Badger for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, since claim 36 contains each of the features as presently recited in independent claim 35, this claim is also patentably distinguishable from Bald and Badger, either individually or combined.

Furthermore, as described above, Bald is directed to a safety compliance test instrument which includes a front panel (18) having a plurality of soft keys (1-4) and a display screen (20) capable of displaying menus and prompts that are activated by soft keys 1-4. See, Bald, col. 4, lines 26-37. However, Bald does not describe generating sub-functions for the buttons as recited in this claim. That is, Bald describes that upon power up of the safety compliance test instrument a verification menu appears. See Bald, Col. 5, lines 35-62, FIG. 3. The verification menu 30 allows a user to select one of four tests by using arrow softkeys to scroll between the tests and a select softkey to select the test to perform. Id. However, once the test has been selected the soft keys are not used during the performance of the test. That is, as illustrated in FIGS. 4A-7C of Bald, once a particular test is selected the safety compliance test instrument merely illustrates instructions for performing the test using additional keys/buttons of the safety compliance test instrument. In other words, the softkeys in Bald are only assigned one function (to scroll, to select, or to exit) and Bald does not describe generating additional functions for the softkeys.

Accordingly, Bald does not disclose or teach, among other things, "wherein the at least one function of the respective at least one button comprises first and second sub-functions, and the generating of the first and second sub-functions comprises selectively generating one of first and second sub-functions according to activation of the respective button," as recited in claim

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

36. Further since Badger does not disclose or teach the limitations lacking in Bald, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36 is itself allowable over these references and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are requested.

6. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a): Bald, Badger, and Ruberry et al.:

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bald in view of Badger and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,287 to Ruberry et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claim 24, it is respectfully submitted that this claim depends from independent claim 19, which is allowable over Bald et al. and Badger for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, for at least the reason that this claim contains each of the features as presently recited in claim 19, dependent claim 24 is also allowable over these references, either individually or combined. Further, since the Examiner cites Ruberry et al. merely to allege it discloses a second set of buttons, Ruberry et al. does not teach or suggest the limitations of these claims which are lacking in Bald et al. and Badger. Therefore, claim 24 is allowable over Bald et al., Badger, and Ruberry et al., either separately or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully requested.

7. Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a): Yu and Kim:

Claims 37-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,346,972 to Kim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

a. Claim 37:

With respect to independent claim 37, on page 11-12 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Yu discloses all of the limitations of the invention as recited in this claim, except that "[Yu] does not explicitly disclose a detector unit to detect whether the device is in a portrait mode or in a landscape mode," and "wherein at least one symbol is displayed which is respectively assigned to the at least one input unit, and wherein the orientation of the at least one symbol is changed in accordance with the result of the detector unit." However, the Examiner then alleges that Kim discloses:

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

a detector unit to detect whether the device is in a portrait mode or in a landscape mode (*a pivot controller for outputting storing position control signals in response to pivot control signal*) (col. 5, lines 8-10), wherein at least one symbol is displayed which is respectively assigned to the at least one input unit, and wherein the orientation of the at least one symbol is changed in accordance with the result of the detector unit (col. 7, lines 51-55) and (fig. 10).

See Office Action, page 12. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither <u>Yu</u> nor <u>Kim</u>, either individually or combined, disclose, teach, or suggest the Applicant's invention as recited in independent claim 37, for at least the following reasons.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegations, <u>Kim</u> does not describe a "detector unit to detect whether the device is in a portrait or in a landscape mode," as recited in claim 37. Instead, <u>Kim</u> requires a user to manipulate a particular key to generate a mode control signal. *See* <u>Kim</u>, Col. 6, lines 1-25. In <u>Kim</u> the controller receives an OSD signal to generate an OSD image and a mode control device to indicate that the display is in a rotated position. *Id.* If the user does not provide the mode control signal, then "the on-screen display will be displayed with the letters and figures laid on their side...." *See* <u>Kim</u>, Col. 6, lines 15-20. In fact, <u>Kim</u> specifically teaches away from the invention as recited in this claim. Instead of describing a "detector unit," <u>Kim</u> requires that a user supply a pivot state/mode control signal.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that <u>Kim</u> does not disclose or teach, among other things, "a detector unit to detect whether the device is in a portrait mode or in a landscape mode," and "wherein at least one symbol is displayed which is respectively assigned to the at least one input unit, and wherein the orientation of the at least one symbol is changed in accordance with the result of the detector unit," as recited in claim 37.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant therefore submits that these references, either individually or combined, do not disclose or teach all of the limitations of the invention as recited in this claim. Accordingly, for at least the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 37 is allowable over <u>Yu</u> and <u>Kim</u>, either individually or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: <u>May 9, 2008</u>
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

of this claim are respectfully solicited.

    b. <u>Claims 38-42:</u>

      With respect to claims 38-42, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 37, which is allowable over <u>Yu</u> and <u>Kim</u> for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in claim 37, dependent claims 38-42 are also allowable over these references, either individually or combined.

      Furthermore, with respect to dependent claim 38, Applicant respectfully submits that neither <u>Yu</u> nor <u>Kim</u> discloses or teaches the limitations recited in this claim. As described above <u>Kim</u> does not describe a "detector unit to detect whether the device is in a portrait or in a landscape mode," as recited in claim 37. Instead, <u>Kim</u> requires a user to manipulate a particular key to generate a mode control signal. *See* <u>Kim</u>, Col. 6, lines 1-25. Accordingly, since instead of describing a "detector unit," <u>Kim</u> requires that a user supply a pivot state/mode control signal, <u>Kim</u> does not disclose "wherein the detector unit detects the portrait mode or the landscape mode in response to a user rotating the screen," as recited in claim 38. Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 38 is itself allowable over these references and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 38-42.

    c. <u>Claims 43-47:</u>

      With respect to claims 43-47, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 37, which is allowable over <u>Yu</u> and <u>Kim</u> for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in claim 37, dependent claims 43-47 are also allowable over these references, either individually or combined.

      Furthermore, with respect to dependent claim 43, Applicant respectfully submits that <u>Kim</u> does not disclose the limitations recited in this claim as the Examiner alleges. In <u>Kim</u>, FIGS. 1, 2, and 10 illustrate a pivotable display device. However, none of these figures illustrate two sets of keys, that is, these figures do not illustrate "wherein the at least one input unit further comprises at least one of group comprising a set of horizontally arranged input keys and a set of vertically arranged input keys," as recited in this claim. Moreover, while the Examiner cites Col.

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: <u>May 9, 2008</u>
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

7, lines 51-61 of <u>Kim</u> as allegedly disclosing this limitation, Col. 7, lines 51-61 merely describes that the R-G-B signals of the OSD are pivoted. <u>Kim</u> does not describe "wherein the at least one input unit further comprises at least one of group comprising a set of horizontally arranged input keys and a set of vertically arranged input keys," as recited in claim 43.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 43 is itself allowable over these references and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 43-47.

   d. <u>Claim 48:</u>

With respect to independent claim 48, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is currently amended to clarify the detection of the state of the display device in order to more clearly distinguish the invention as claimed from the cited documents. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses, teaches, or suggests all of the limitations presently recited in independent claim 48.

In particular, as described above, <u>Kim</u> does not describe detecting a rotated state of a display device. Instead, <u>Kim</u> requires a user to manipulate a particular key to generate a mode control signal to indicate that the display device is in a rotated state. See <u>Kim</u>, Col. 6, lines 1-25. If the user does not provide the mode control signal, then "the on-screen display will be displayed with the letters and figures laid on their side...." See <u>Kim</u>, Col. 6, lines 15-20. In fact, <u>Kim</u> specifically teaches away from the invention as recited in this claim since instead of detecting the rotated state, <u>Kim</u> requires that a user supply a pivot state/mode control signal.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that <u>Kim</u> does not disclose or teach, among other things, "detecting a rotated state of the display device," and "changing an orientation of the at least one symbol according to the detection of the rotated state of the display device," as presently recited in claim 48.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that since <u>Yu</u> and <u>Kim</u>, either individually or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations presently recited in independent claim 48, this claim is allowable over these references, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

e. Claims 49-62:

With respect to claims 49-62, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 48, which is allowable over Yu and Kim for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in claim 48, dependent claims 49-62 are also allowable over these references, either individually or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

f. Claim 63:

With respect to independent claim 63, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is currently amended to clarify a changing of an orientation of the at least one symbol in order to more clearly distinguish the invention as claimed from the cited documents. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses, teaches, or suggests all of the limitations presently recited in independent claim 36.

In particular, as described above, Kim does not describe detecting a rotated state of a display device. Instead, Kim requires a user to manipulate a particular key to generate a mode control signal to indicate that the display device is in a rotated state. See Kim, Col. 6, lines 1-25. If the user does not provide the mode control signal, then "the on-screen display will be displayed with the letters and figures laid on their side...." See Kim, Col. 6, lines 15-20. In fact, Kim specifically teaches away from the invention as recited in this claim since instead of detecting the rotated state, Kim requires that a user supply a pivot state/mode control signal.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Kim does not disclose or teach, among other things, "changing an orientation of the at least one symbol in accordance with a detection of a viewing state of the screen, in which the viewing state relates to a rotated state of the screen" as presently recited in claim 63.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that since Yu and Kim, either individually or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations presently recited in independent claim 63, this claim is allowable over these references, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are respectfully solicited.

Serial No.: 10/822,847
Docket No.: 101-1033
Amendment after Final dated: May 9, 2008
Reply to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2008

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: May 9, 2008   By: _____

919 18th St., NW, Suite 440   Manuel A. Cordovez
Washington, DC 20006   Registration No. 58,480
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901